



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2015

Ms. Aneli Dorough
Custodian of Records
Kaufman County Sheriff's Office
1900 East US Highway 175
Kaufman, Texas 75142

OR2015-26923

Dear Ms. Dorough:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 591687.

The Kaufman County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for all probable cause affidavits, incident reports, or recordings of any arrests or incident reports for closed investigations pertaining to two named individuals. You state you have released some information. We understand you have redacted social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request requires the sheriff’s office to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the individuals named in the request, and, thus, implicates the named individuals’ right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the sheriff’s office maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the sheriff’s office must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual’s criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note you have submitted information that does not list either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals’ criminal histories, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101.

We note portions of this information are subject to common-law privacy. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). Further, under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering

²We note the sheriff’s office did not comply with section 552.301(b) of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). Nevertheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.³ *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information other statutes make confidential, such as section 576.005 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, “[r]ecords of a mental health facility that directly or indirectly identify a present, former, or proposed patient are confidential unless disclosure is permitted by other state law.” Health & Safety Code § 576.005. You contend the submitted information is confidential under section 576.005. However, we note the information at issue consists of law enforcement records of the sheriff's office. Accordingly, the sheriff's office has failed to demonstrate section 576.005 applies to the information at issue. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 576.005 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2* (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” *Open Records*

³Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege.

You state Exhibit 9 contains the identity of a witness and contend his identifying information is protected under the informer's privilege. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

We understand you have redacted some information under section 552.130 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.130(c).⁴ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must also withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the sheriff's office maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the sheriff's office must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

⁴Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/bhf

Ref: ID# 591687

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)